



Sincerely yours,  
Ted Kaczynski

# THE UNABOMBER LETTERS

## A YAHOO NEWS SPECIAL REPORT

# Friends on "Bombers Row"

At Colorado's ADX, Kaczynski befriended two other high-profile inmates: Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh and Ramzi Yousef, who was convicted in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. For a time, the three were exercise buddies who occupied neighboring prison cells.

All letters and documents are property of  
the University of Michigan Library's Labadie Collection.

The selection was curated by Yahoo News

# YAHOO!

NEWS



LEO KALCZYNSKI  
to  
RICK SALLINGER

March 7, 1999

Dear Rick,

Thanks for your letter of February 17.

In answer to your question, yes, I do share  
exercise time with Timothy McVeigh and Ramzi  
Yousef.



March 17, 1999

Dear Ted,

Thanks very much for your letter of March 7, 1999. As you requested I am enclosing copies of your letters and am signing them for you.

I appreciate your confirmation that you share exercise time with Mc Veigh and Ramzi Yousef. Is there anything else you can tell me about your relationship with them or anyone else I may have heard of in the prison? The prison officials make it sound like any shared exercise time with them would be random chance, the news story makes it appear like it's regular. Did I send you the story about the New York gang leader Luis Felipe? His attorney received permission from a judge for him to share exercise time with you, Mc Veigh and Yousef, but Felipe says he doesn't want to.



\*

As to the questions you asked in your letter of March 17: For a while Timothy McVeigh, Ramzi Yousef, and I shared exercise time fairly regularly. As you probably know, McVeigh has now been moved to



Terre Haute, Indiana. I have not recently shared exercise time with Ramzi Yousef, but I do frequently take rec with a couple of other well-known inmates. I won't mention their names without their permission. (I had Ramzi's and McVeigh's permission to talk about our shared rec time.) Both Ramzi and McVeigh are very intelligent, and they are friendly and considerate of others. I know very little of what the media have said about Ramzi, but I can say that McVeigh has been misrepresented by the media.

None of the foregoing remarks are to be construed as an endorsement of actions of which Ramzi and McVeigh have been accused.

In answer to your letter of June 2: I appreciate your kindly concern. I'm doing alright. Judge Burrell's denial of my motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 was expected, since he was the judge who tried me in the first place. I've now applied to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit for permission to appeal to that court, and that's where I just might have a chance, if only a very slim one.

Best regards,  
Ted Kaczynski



situps, etc.

You asked me to invite Timothy McVeigh to "go suck a coprolite." I'm not sure if I remember what the word "coprolite" means — it's not in my dictionary — but I think it means a fossilized dinosaur turd or something along those lines. Am I right? Anyway, I'm not going to invite McVeigh to go suck one. I don't know whether he did what they say he did, or what his motives were if he did do it, but on a personal level he is a very decent fellow, friendly and considerate of others. My impression is that he and Ramzi Yousef are both very bright. Actually, the people I'm acquainted with in this range of cells (known as "celebrity row") are nicer than the majority of people I've known on the outside. I should add that a lot of what the media have printed about McVeigh is crap. He is not a "neonazi racist" — far from it — and he doesn't believe that satellites control people or that he has a



computer chip implanted in his chest.

You'll recall that problem about polynomials — if  $f(x)$  is a polynomial with real coefficients and if  $f(x)^n$ , for some positive integer  $n$ , has rational coefficients, then  $f(x)$  has rational coefficients. I don't know whether you still want me to take you through the proof of that. If you do, let me know, and I'll give you the next instalment of the proof.

Hoping that you do well on your final exams —

Ted Kaczynski

P.S. You added a postscript to your note of 5/18/97: "Like the Frogs?" I am perplexed. What frogs are you referring to?

— TK



CLASS 1

Dear Dr Kaczynski,

June 1 1999

It was my pleasure to send you the book for your birthday! I knew I enclosed a short note along with it, but I wrote that very early in the morning and do not recall what I said. I asked a girl in my math class (who works at a book store) to pick me up a humorous book that would be fit for "someone who has probably read everything." She is a very nice girl that I study with frequently (sometimes I refer to her as my "Math-girlfriend") and she even wrapped it in paper with pictures of Frogs. Now, I can assume that since you were not sure what I meant by "like the frogs?" that they (prison officials) did not let you open it. In addition, they probably had a dog sniff it for a firecracker before they opened it - Do you think so?

There is a correlation between my statements: 1) "Please ask Mr McVeigh to go suck a coprolite<sup>my</sup> (coprolite = very old poop) and 2) "Anyone who targets the weak is a real loser." The question about Darwin was just a secondary thought. The reason I made the <sup>second</sup> first statement, if I remember correctly, was because of the way Benvenuto Cellini was treated in his later years. Reading that reminded me about the things I seem to constantly see on the news about elderly people being victimized. The first statement, directed toward Mr McVeigh, I made because of something on the news. That something was a toddler completely covered in blood..... The correlation has to do with my "personal psychology," I suppose. For example, things seem to affect me on an emotional level greater than others. This often causes me to 1) Say exactly what I think 2) Have a bad day due to dwelling on other people's misfortunes, and/or 3) Become



TED KACZYNSKI  
to

016100

May 21, 1999

CLASS J

Dear Mr. :

I've just received the book that you kindly sent me for my birthday, and I would like to express my appreciation of your thoughtfulness. My experience of young males (age 13-25), and of having been one myself, is that they generally tend to be rather hardnosed and callous, so, for your age and sex, I would say that you are remarkably considerate of other people.

While we are on the subject of birthdays — I trust that you received the birthday greeting that I sent you; and you may be interested to know that your birthday, April 27, is the same as that of Ramzi Yousef, the alleged "mastermind" of the World Trade Center Bombing. I mentioned this to Ramzi, and he wants me to tell you that, since your birthday is the same as his, you and he must have similar personalities. I'm not sure how serious he is. He may have some degree of belief in astrology.

\*



Understanding of Science.

You asked me to cite any clear similarities or differences between your personality and that of Ramzi Yousef, the alleged mastermind of the World Trade Center bombing. I honestly can't think of any clear similarities or differences between you two. I only have a vague sense that you are in some ways similar and in some ways different. I put your question to Ramzi, and he suggested that you should look at the July issue of Penthouse magazine, which contains an article about him and McVeigh. I hesitate to mention Penthouse to you, since I certainly don't want to encourage you to read any publications of that ilk (I can tell you in all seriousness that I wouldn't have a copy of Penthouse in my cell); but then, you probably read it anyway, so what the heck.



[ TJK to George Woodsel a.k.a. Paul Rogers  
9/19/99 ]

struggles. I consider them irrelevant. Apparently I made some remarks in the interviews that could have been interpreted as meaning that I favored national liberation struggles, but that was not my intention. If I had been writing an article rather than answering questions orally and extemporaneously for an interviewer, I would have been careful to word my statements in such a way that they could not be misunderstood.

I would be much more likely to accept the TV interview offer if I could be provided with a list of questions in advance, so that I could prepare my answers carefully.

It's possible that my remarks about cops, too, may have been partly misunderstood.

Yes, I was amused by the answer you gave to the letter received by my mother. As for conversion to Islam, there is a Muslim inmate here who would like to convert me. He's even got me reading the Koran. I'm not about to be converted just yet, though. If I ever do get converted I'll ask you to take up a collection to buy me a camel and a burnoose.

Timothy McVeigh would like to receive a copy of Green Anarchist. He's been moved to Terre Haute, Indiana, where he will probably be executed about a year from now. His current address is:



September 21, 1999

Tom Wheeler  
Alternative Press Review  
P.O. Box 4710  
Arlington VA 22204

Dear Mr. Wheeler:

Enclosed find my permission for you to reprint my piece, "Ship of Fools". As for payment, the legal situation is somewhat tangled. Any income I receive from writings, etc., is supposed to be taken for restitution to the alleged victims of the Unabom offenses. But some of the alleged victims are owed in addition a number of millions of dollars as a result of civil suits that they filed against me. Thus there may be rival claims. Moreover, I probably could not accept payment for anything I write, because that would be considered "running a business," which is contrary to Bureau of Prison rules. On the other hand, if you do not pay your usual fee for reprinting "Ship of Fools," the alleged victims might claim that the money is owing to them. But considering the small sum involved, I doubt that they would make an issue of it. I'll just have to leave all that for you to figure out.

Incidentally, I think Timothy McVeigh would appreciate a subscription to Alternative Press Review. (Contrary to the



impression you may have received from the media, he's neither - a racist nor a neo-nazi nor anything of the kind.) He's now been moved to Terre Haute, Indiana, where he will probably be executed a little more than a year from now. His address is

Timothy McVeigh  
Number 12076-064  
United States Prison Terre Haute  
~~Terre Haute, Indiana 47808~~  
Highway 63 South  
Terre Haute, Indiana 47808

Sincerely yours,

Ted Kaczynski



11/21/00

Dear Ted,

My name is Lou Michel and I'm writing Tim McVeigh's authorized biography and I was hoping you would provide me w/some insights into Tim's character after having lived w/him over the past couple years. Tim, in fact, suggested you might be able to share some prison stories of life at Supermax for the book. I met w/Tim for four days last May out at the prison and just last week I met w/him for 2 days at Terre Haute. His "keen" sense of humor remains intact, despite a long period of adjustment at the federal death row. I wish you well with your book and your appeal efforts. When Tim's biography is published, I'll be sure and send you a copy, though the hard-bound covers will be removed. The book is still a long ways from completion, but progress is steady!

I am writing the book w/my colleague Dan Herbeck, who, like me, works full time as a Buffalo News reporter.

Though you and Tim are different in many ways, I can certainly see a common thread. You both love the rustic outdoors and share similar political beliefs and disdain for certain elements of law enforcement, as evidenced by some of your comments in the Time Magazine interview you recently granted. I'll close now hoping that you will grant my request for the start of a correspondence that will help in boosting the literary portrait I am crafting on Tim.

Many thanks,  
Lou Michel



2/26/00

Dear Ted,

I have spoken w/ Blake Davis, Warden Michael V. Pugh's executive assistant, regarding your concerns with addressing my questions regarding your thoughts on Timothy McVeigh. ~~Blake~~ Blake Davis and the Warden have informed me that I may establish a mail correspondence with you. The intent is not to pass any information along to Mr. McVeigh. There's a good chance he will have been executed under his court-imposed death penalty before the book, his biography, is published. I am told that under media privilege you may address my previous questions and that those responses will be sealed and sent to me. In addition to your general observations of your past relationships with Mr. McVeigh, I would also be interested in hearing your general thoughts on the Oklahoma City bombing and behavior of federal law enforcement, and finally, any other thoughts you would care to share with me. Also, would you please address the prospect of spending life in prison. I know your thoughts on it already from public comments you have previously made but would deeply appreciate them coming directly from you to me. Including I would like to note, the administrative staff at ADX has gone out of its way to cooperate in my endeavors, which I appreciate.

Sincerely,

You Michel



5/9/00 192

Dear Ted,

I am in receipt of your 11-page letter. I truly appreciate your correspondence. I also know that Timothy McVeigh appreciates the effort you have made to assist in putting together a complete picture of him for his life story. Ted, I realize

you want out on a limb, considering that media so often misinterprets and <sup>sometimes</sup> intentionally twists what is said in order to streamline stories and make them fit preconceived notions. I realize

a major trust has been placed in me and Dan Herbert, who are working on this project together.

We are remaining as neutral as humanly possible to put together an honest, straightforward accounting.

Yes, we will respect your request that your letter be used in its entirety. Even without your condition we would have wanted to use the whole letter in our "prison chapter."

It is obviously well thought out and I can see a good deal of thought went into its crafting. McVeigh is one of the most open and honest individuals I have ever written about. Ted, you strike me the same way. That transcript you received of Tim's appearance on the <sup>60 mins</sup> show will undoubtedly make for interesting reading. When you're finished with it, if you plan to discard it, I would be grateful to receive it since I plan on using his observations regarding his thoughts on you and him.



2 of 2

I do have a VCR recording of the show, however.

Finally, when the book on Timothy McVergh comes out, hopefully next year, Daw and I will be sending you a copy, minus the hard cover. Ted, I wish you well in your appeal and if I can be of service, please let me know.

Take care,  
Joe Thichel

P.S. I too am a jogger, and used to jog in place while washing dishes to make double use of my time. Have since stopped, since my wife bought a dishwasher. Also, jogging in place began hurting my knee joints as I got older. Again take care and thank you for your thoughtfulness!

P.S. P.S. Ted, we will be working on this book for several more months & if you have any additional thoughts on Tim or related matters, we would welcome them.



# FREEDOMS END



P.O. Box 115 ♦ Decker, MI 48426  
Phone 517-872-3813 ♦ Fax 1-517-872-3818 ♦ Home Phone 517-872-5486

Oct. 16, 2000

Ted Kaczynski  
U.S.P. ADX  
P.O. Box 8500  
Florence, CO 81226

*this means  
Tim McVeigh*

My name is Bob Papovich and I am a friend of Tim's. Early last year I did a journalistic interview with him at the ADX and during my conversation with Executive Assistant Davis I asked if it would be possible to contact you. He said you would receive my letter even if I didn't include your lifetime, preferred diem membership number. So please let me know if you received it.

Considering what I've been told about you, I thought you might be interested in this article about partitions and perhaps the advertisements. Some of the conclusions by the researchers seem obvious to me but I can understand the considerable time involved in proving the partitions of larger numbers prior to the computer age, even during.

*The book is pure crackpot stuff.*

In '97 I finished the book "Freedom's End - Conspiracy In Oklahoma" and queried 50 to 60 publishers all over the globe. Following the advice of my editor I promoted the book as an "as told to" by James Nichols. Big mistake. An independent publisher from Vegas told me word was out not to publish. He told me even if I published myself we would never get distribution at which point I told him he was full of it. After all, I had the primary author as James Nichols and the actual writer (yours truly) knew all three of these guys, James and Terry intimately and Tim casually. The independent knew exactly what he was talking about and I didn't have the foggiest. He was right. I did have to publish Freedom's End myself and couldn't get distribution. Recently (considerably after the window of opportunity had closed) Amazon Advantage agreed to carry our book but we're lucky to break even after their "discount" to us.

*This is Terry Nichols, McVeigh's co-defendant*

It's always bothered me that all of these so-called authors who didn't know any of the alleged conspirators had no problem getting their books published but one of the actual accused and an author who knew all of them couldn't pique the interest of any publisher. Some time ago I heard you were writing a book and couldn't find a publisher. More recently I heard that you had. Please let me know your book status when you can "find the time."

I'm sending you a copy of the book I've written assuming you have the time to read it since you probably have more of that than anything else. Keep in mind that I'm a sign painter by trade with only a high school education. The editing was minimal and I only had eleven hours to proof read the entire copy prior to printing which obviously was not enough. Please forgive the typo errors.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

*Notes in pencil  
are by TJK,  
10/24/00*

Bob Papovich  
5080 Van Dyke  
Cass City, MI 48726



TED KACZYNSKI  
to

582

May 7, 2001

UUE

Dear Ms. Abbott:

Today I received your letter of May 2. Many months ago I wrote journalist Lou Michel a long letter about Timothy McVeigh. If I remember correctly, Mr. Michel told me that the entire letter would be printed in a book he was writing about McVeigh. Apparently that book, American Terrorist, by Lou Michel and Dan Herbeck, has now been published. See Newsweek, April 9, 2001, page 23.

If the entire letter was not published in American Terrorist, maybe you can get a copy of it from Mr. Michel, whose address is 3461 Wilson-Cambria Road, Wilson NY 14172.

I have very little to add to what I wrote in that letter. I'll mention, though, that McVeigh seemed to be very interested in the book Into the Wild, by Jon Krakauer.

Sincerely yours,

Ted Kaczynski



Postmarked 6/19/01 161

Dr. Kaczynski,

Some time ago you sent me a birthday card that I never thanked you for. Since then, you have had two birthdays and I do not recall sending you a card for either of them. I apologize for my apathy and thank you for your kind gesture.

My life has changed significantly since I last wrote. I now live in \_\_\_\_\_ and am attending University of \_\_\_\_\_. I must admit that pharmacy does not terribly interest me, but it seems to be a secure and relatively lucrative career. I don't know if you have ever been \_\_\_\_\_, but would think you a lucky fellow if you have not.

I have been working the late shift at the pharmacy for extra money. I have had unrelenting insomnia for many years and the late shift is a good opportunity because I can study when things slow down. Pharmacy school is a challenge. Some of the material is interesting (such as Mechanisms of Drug Action) and some is quite boring (such as "Pharmacy Systems." Pharmacy Systems is the "liberal arts" component of my pharmacy degree). But I suppose that is the case with any major one could select. There seem to be a disproportionate amount of "morally conservative" people in my class, which does not bother me as much as it interests me. I enjoy discussing issues such as stem cell research with them because it helps me understand their opposition. Although I respect their opinions, I think they are slightly deluded.

I remember writing you a letter some time ago in which I mentioned Timothy McVeigh. I recall having harsh words about his actions, but do not recall what I may or may not have said regarding his potential execution. As you surely know, he was recently executed. And, contrary to what I may have said regarding the death penalty previously, I think it wrong today\*. It is little more than official revenge and that should not be the function of our justice system, in my opinion. Why the law would allow for the execution of a perfectly healthy 33 year old man, yet deny a terminally ill person the right to physician-assisted suicide is completely beyond my understanding. It is impossible to have a perfect justice system, that is, some quantity of people will always be wrongfully punished. There have been many people that have been executed and later found innocent through DNA evidence. Perhaps the supporters of the death penalty could write a letter to the families of the wrongfully executed and explain to them that the loss of their loved one is "collateral damage." What is your opinion on the death penalty issue?

I must go now because I am in the process of moving into a cheaper apartment and have a lot of work ahead of me. Again, thank you for the birthday card.

Best regards,

\*If I were a pharmacist working in the prison I suppose that I would be the one responsible to draw up the chemicals used in the killing of an inmate. Despite the fact that I will never work in a prison, that is a troubling thought.



012111  
[ TJK to

6/27/01]

5.

DNA evidence. I think there's good reason to believe that innocent prisoners have been executed, but I don't see that that is worse than an innocent prisoner's having to serve a life sentence. Of course, the argument is... Oh, hell with it. I don't want to say anything serious. Not in the mood for it.

I agree with you about the death penalty being "official revenge." I mean, it was natural for the relatives of people killed in the Oklahoma City bombing to want McVeigh to die. That's the law of nature. An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life. But if they haven't got the guts to take their own revenge, then they shouldn't whine for the government to do it for them. I'm a great believer in self-reliance. If people want the government to do things for them, then they have no right to complain when the govt. charges them taxes or subjects them to regulations. They can't have it both ways.

\*

\*

\*

Seriously, now, you don't need to apologize for the birthday-card thing. And I do hope that things are going well for you.

Best regards,  
Ted Kaczynski



TED KACZYNSKI  
to

September 18, 2002

Dear Ms. ,

Yesterday I received the photocopy of the article about "Critter" that you sent me, and also the photocopied page from a dictionary with the definition of "byline". I thank you very much for obtaining this material for me. I do appreciate it.

You ask me about Timothy McVeigh. There is a Bureau of Prisons rule that prohibits inmates from sending out letters that give information about other inmates. I'm not sure whether this applies to McVeigh, since he's now dead, but, rather than risk having this letter turned back by the censors, I'll omit all information about McVeigh. However, a book about McVeigh has been published under the title "American Terrorist." One of the two authors is Lou Michel; I forget the other author's name, but I expect that as a librarian you will be able to find that out and get the book on an interlibrary loan if your own library doesn't have it. In that book is reprinted a long letter from me to Lou Michel in which I give my impressions of McVeigh. (I was allowed to send that letter because inmates have special privileges in communicating with journalists, and moreover I had the prison authorities' approval for that letter.)



TED KACZYNSKI  
to

0841.0

October 19, 2002

Dear

I received your letter of 10/5/02, postmarked 10/7/02, just a couple of days ago, which means that it took about ten days to reach me.

Anyway, I'm glad you liked Kabloona. It is a very fine book. I wonder if you've read the following books: Elizabeth Marshall Thomas, The Harmless People (about the Bushmen of Southern Africa); Colin Turnbull, The Forest People, and Wayward Servants: The Two Worlds of the African Pygmies; John D. Hunter, Manners and Customs of Several Indian Tribes ... (etc. — long title); Edwin James, A Narrative of the Captivity and Adventures of John Tanner (these last two are accounts of whites who were captured in childhood by the Indians and lived as Indians for many years). I'm sure you would greatly appreciate any of these books. But maybe you've read some of them already.

You mention Into the Wild, by John Krakauer. I've read it. It was recommended to me by a very high-profile inmate, now deceased, who was formerly on this range of cells with me. He had a journalist named Lou Michel send me a copy of it from the outside. Interesting book,



TJK to

10/19/02

084110

(2)

and significant. But the book I would really like to get my hands on is one that you've mentioned in earlier letters: Earth First!: Environmental Apocalypse, by Martha Lee.

Beautiful photos that you sent me. But I'm not sure I enjoy them — they make me so hungry to be out in the mountains again. However, you can send me as many more such photos as you like.

I have to cut this letter short here, because I have to compose three long, complicated letters connected with the problem of finding a home for the documents that my former lawyers are holding for me. Pain in the rear. But it has to be done soon.

Best regards,

Ted

[Sent to ..... address]



DR. MATTHEW SHEPTOSKI  
1418 BACE or RACE #2  
KALAMAZOO MI 49001

As of 1/10/03 I have  
received no answer to  
this. — TJK

Dear Dr. Sheptoski:

I have read your dissertation, "Ideology or Insanity? Media Presentation of Ted Kaczynski and Tim McVeigh." I think you are quite right in concluding that the media tended to portray me as mentally ill to a much greater extent than they did McVeigh, and that they were more apt to attribute political motivations to McVeigh than to me. Your conclusion confirms the subjective impression I had already formed from what I had read in the print media. It is obvious moreover that our society for a long time has been using the concept of mental illness to disguise certain negative value-judgments as statements of medical fact, and that the media have played an important role in this "medicalization" process.

However, for several reasons I think your dissertation provides very little if any support for the hypothesis that "violent political protest from the right has been accepted as politically and ideologically motivated, while violent political protest from the left has been marginalized" (page 94 of the dissertation).

First, your assumption that Kaczynski was a left-wing anarchist is incorrect. The following paragraph appears in the covering letter that FC sent to The New York Times with the manuscript



of "Industrial Society and Its Future" (the "Manifesto"):

"We decided to call ourselves anarchists not in order to associate ourselves with any particular anarchist group or movement but only because we felt we needed some label to apply to ourselves and 'anarchist' was the only one that seemed to fit. The term 'anarchist' has been applied to a wide variety of attitudes and about the only thing these attitudes have in common is opposition to the power of governments and other large organizations. That certainly fits us."

Thus, although the existing American anarchist movement is considered left-wing, there was no reason to connect Kaczynski with that movement or with any other left-wing movement. The term "anarchist", when used in the broad sense indicated above, certainly need not imply "left-wing". In fact it is my recollection that during the mid-1990's the media quoted some conservative figure as having called the militias "anarchist."

Any notion that FC was left-wing should have been dispelled by the content of the Manifesto. On page 35 of your dissertation you say that the Manifesto "specifically criticized 'leftists'", which is a considerable understatement. It was obvious that the author of the Manifesto despised leftists.

Of course, you could argue that the foregoing would not necessarily prevent the media from identifying Kaczynski as a leftist, since journalists



are so careless about facts that they could easily have overlooked the ones I've just mentioned. So let's assume that the media did indeed see Kaczynski as left-wing. Even so your data provide very little support for the hypothesis that the media treat violent political protest on the right differently from violent political protest on the left.

It is very hazardous to draw general conclusions from comparison of only two individual cases, because differences found between the two cases may be attributable to circumstances peculiar to the specific cases in question. A valid test of the general hypothesis would require, at a minimum, examination of many individual cases.

There were in fact circumstances peculiar to Kaczynski's and McVeigh's cases that could have explained their differential treatment by the media without recourse to the hypothesis that the media are biased against the left. For example, beginning shortly after his arrest, Kaczynski's mother and brother began giving media interviews in which they portrayed him as mentally ill. (They lied. See the manuscript Truth versus Lies that I mentioned in my previous letter.) To my knowledge, no similar factor was present in McVeigh's case. Hence all difference in the extent to which the media medicalized Kaczynski and McVeigh respectively, after the time when Kaczynski's mother and brother began giving their



interviews, could easily be attributed to this factor and therefore has little if any value in demonstrating a media bias against the left.

Rather than comparing media treatment of Kaczynski and McVeigh, it would have been more to the point to compare media treatment of the American anarchist movement and of the militia movement. I would be willing to bet that if such a study were carefully and objectively carried out, it would show that, say, from 1995 to 1998, the media treated the militia movement much more harshly than they treated the anarchist movement. This would shoot down the hypothesis that the media "medicalized" Kaczynski more than they did McVeigh because they were biased against the "left-wing" anarchists as contrasted with the "right-wing" militias.

Furthermore, even a study comparing the media's treatment of anarchists with their treatment of the militias would yield no general conclusions as to the media's treatment of the left versus their treatment of the right. It is a dubious procedure to lump together all "leftists" as if the media necessarily treated them all in the same way; and it is dead wrong to lump together all "rightists" as if the media treated all of them in the same way.

One could make a good argument that there is sufficient psychological and ideological cohesion



among the various factions of the American left so that it is possible to speak of the left as a unit, though it does not necessarily follow that the media treat all left-wing factions similarly.

But it is nonsense to speak of "the right" as a unit, and it is certain that the media do not treat all factions called "right-wing" in the same way. The word "right", as it is used in America today, is a catch-all term that is applied to groups that have radically different and mutually conflicting ideologies. Compare, for example, the current G.W. Bush administration with the Montana Freeman. The latter were radically individualistic and refused to obey the law or recognize the authority of the government; and I think some militias had similar ideologies. Both they and the Bush administration have been called "right-wing"; but it is safe to assume that the two groups would have no use for one another; and it is clear that they have not been treated similarly by the media.

Thus, supposing that a difference had been demonstrated between the media's treatment of anarchists and their treatment of the militias, one could not infer from this that there would be a similar difference between the media's treatment of the left in general and their



treatment of the right in general.

Independently of all of the foregoing, your data have little value in showing a media bias against the left because the media's differential treatment of Kaczynski and McVeigh could easily be accounted for by an alternative hypothesis, namely, that the media were much more interested in discrediting the militias than they were in discrediting the anarchists. Under this hypothesis, the media would have attributed McVeigh's action to his militia-like ideology rather than to mental illness because the overwhelming majority of Americans were horrified by the Oklahoma City bombing, and media presentation of that bombing as an expression of a militia-associated ideology would have tended strongly to discredit the militias.

It is worth noting that, in a precisely analogous tactic, Kaczynski was used to discredit the radical environmentalist movement. In his book Ecoterror: The World of the Unabomber, Ron Arnold, an extractive-industry shill and co-founder of the "wise use" movement, portrayed Kaczynski as politically-motivated rather than mentally ill, and argued that Kaczynski had derived his ideology from the radical environmentalists. It is quite clear from Arnold's book that he did this in order to discredit the radical-environmentalist movement. The fact that the



mainstream media did not try to use Kaczynski to discredit radical environmentalism can be accounted for by the existence of significant sympathy for environmentalism in the media.

Frankly, I think the claim that the media are biased against the left and in favor of the right is a lot of crap. The media are biased against whatever appears to be a threat to the security of the existing system, and there are at least as many threats to the system from the right as from the left. I don't doubt that the kind of biasing process described by Herman and Chomsky does exist, but I would argue that it is directed as much against the right as against the left.

Sincerely yours,

Ted Kaczynski

THEODORE JOHN KACZYNSKI

04475-046

U.S. PENITENTIARY MAX

P.O. BOX 8500

FLORENCE CO 81226-8500

Enclosure: Copy of covering letter sent to New York Times with manuscript of the Manifesto by FC.



There are a lot of other things, much more important from my point of view, that I need to read, but I don't know when I will ever get to them.

Apparently the government has done nothing about arranging the auction of my papers. It's strange. I don't understand it. I'm sure they're not stalling for fear of letting my ideas out. Most of those papers are personal, do not contain "ideas", and in fact could be used to make me look bad, especially if parts were taken out of context.

I don't doubt that the government's and the courts' hostility toward me has a lot to do with ideas. In deciding some of the issues in my recent appeal the Ninth Circuit flatly ignored legal precedent, and in allowing victims to "credit-bid" on items that don't sell in the auction, the judges even ignored their own earlier ruling that the government could refuse to return property to me only if the property were needed to fulfill the terms of the restitution order. Some of the issues on which the Ninth Circuit clearly decided wrongly, such as the credit-bidding issue and the disposition of the so-called "bomb-making" materials, were of very little practical importance. Ordinarily, when a court decides against someone for improper reasons, one expects the judges to decide against him on the big issues but to decide in his favor on the minor issues (if he's right on those issues), because that way the judges seem to be making an effort to be fair. But in my case the judges ignored the law to decide against me even on the trivial issues. It looks as if the judges hated me so much that they couldn't bear to let me win even on the most minor point, no matter how obviously right I was.

What would explain this visceral hatred on the part of the judges, and for that matter on the part of many



0145.2

other people who are deeply committed to the existing system? It can't be just the fact that I was convicted of killing 3 people, because that is hardly unique. Even McVeigh, who killed 169, doesn't seem to have aroused so much passionate hatred. In certain circles I seem to be viewed as the worst man since Adolf Hitler.

Why? It's got to be the ideas. McVeigh had no ideas to speak of. Others, like Jacques Ellul, have had ideas similar to mine, but they have not been men of action and have had no program for putting their ideas into practice. The radical environmentalists (e.g., ELF) have some ideas related to mine, and they actually do attempt revolutionary actions, and that is why they are said to be the FBI's number two enemy. (The Islamics are said to be number one.) But the radical environmentalists' ideas are at the first-grade level, and as revolutionaries they are not very effective.

I think what gets the judges of the Ninth Circuit is: (i) My actions were in the service of ideas that have attracted widespread interest and are sufficiently sophisticated to be taken seriously by intelligent people. (ii) Those ideas challenge the very foundation of the system that gives the judges their power and their prestige, and on which everything that the judges value is dependent. (iii) The judges probably share with many other people the uneasy sense that the system's problems are getting uncontrollable, and that the system is heading for a fall.\* (iv) Though they would never admit it, the judges may be afraid I might be right, and that's what would make them hate me most of all.

---

\* A very bright college student recently wrote to me: "My thoughts on the future have always been fearful or 'grim'. ... I can't imagine where the world will be in 30 yrs. Greeze ... I don't like to think about it."



Your letter of 11/14/07. I don't believe the claim that McVeigh's truck bomb could not have destroyed the Murrah Building. How do you know there was a "strong consensus of experts"? Did you go around and interview the experts yourself? Or are you taking someone else's word for it? There's just too much bullshit out there. You should read Farhad Manjoo, True Enough: Learning to Live in a Post-Fact Society, Wiley & Sons, 2008. For a start, if your "experts" said McVeigh used "ammonium nitrate and diesel fuel" as you indicate in your letter, they are ignorant. ~~are talking about~~ McVeigh actually mixed something more powerful with his ammonium nitrate. I won't tell you what it was, because I don't want the censors to think I'm giving you instructions for making explosives. But the information is public knowledge, reported in the media.

If you have access to a law library, you can check out the published judicial opinion United States versus McVeigh, 153 F.3d 1166 (10th Cir. 1998). You can also get judicial opinions off the Internet, though I don't know exactly how. Federal judges are not above lying when they find it convenient, but, even so, the judicial opinion is probably a lot more reliable than whatever sources you've used.

On 11/14/07, I'm more familiar with the